UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/587,302	07/26/2006	Ralf Wnuk	51540	6536	
ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, L.L.P. 1300 19TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON,, DC 20036			EXAMINER		
			ANDERSON, DENISE R		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1797		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/25/2010	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/587,302	WNUK, RALF	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Denise R. Anderson	1797	

	Denise R. Anderson	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(t)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount on the tened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in between appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed in the present additional claims. 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1.4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.2.5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	16 and 41.33(a)). 11. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	,
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 11-25. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Walter D. Griffin/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797			

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Applicant amended claims 16 and 24 to recite "a bar screen tube filter element." The term was cited for indefiniteness and the claims were examined in light of paragraph 28 in the Specification which disclosed "tubular wedge-wire screen filter elements." A secondary reference, Wnuk et al. (US 2003/0213127), was brought in to explicitly disclose the tubular wedge-wire screen filter elements. Applicant has amended the claims to recite a "tubular screen filter element." The new matters raised are (1) whether the Specification supports this move away from frustoconical filter elements and (2) whether the Wnuk et al. reference is required in the rejection.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that the objection to the substitute Specification should be withdrawn because, "Nothing in the record supports the conclusionary allegation that 'automatic clutch' is a narrower term" than "free wheeling device." Applicant offers evidence that an automatic clutch is equivalent to a freewheeling clutch. The examiner responds by noting that the term "automatic clutch" is being substituted for "free wheeling device," not "freewheeling clutch." The examiner maintains that an "automatic clutch" is a narrower term relative to a "free wheeling device," and cites Bodenhorn (U.S. Patent No. 1,850,197, Mar. 22, 1932). Bodenhorn discloses an "Automobile Free Wheeling Device" in Fig. 1 and shows the automatic clutch, as part of the free wheeling device, in Fig. 6. Bodenhorn, Title; p. 1, lines 23-28 and 40-45. As such, the examiner maintains the objection to the Specification.

Regarding the new limitations, the arguments put forth have been considered but are not persuasive because they relate to an amendment that has not been entered. The remaining arguments put forth were previously addressed in the final rejection.